

# Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Agenda

June 21, 2001 • 12:45a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Whitewater/Clearwater Rooms

University of Idaho / Moscow, Idaho

Page

## Consent Agenda Items

1. Approval of Committee Minutes .....	2
a. Exhibit 1a Minutes of IRSA April 19, 2001 Meeting .....	3
b. Exhibit 1b Minutes of CAAP March 29, 2001 Meeting .....	13
c. Exhibit 1c Minutes of CAAP April 11, 2001 Meeting .....	18
d. Exhibit 1d Minutes of HERC March 6, 2001 Meeting .....	21

## Committee Reports/Agenda Items

2. Idaho's MOST Update-- <i>Jim Hammond and Patty Toney</i> .....	22
3. Achievement Standards Update-- <i>Lydia Guerra</i> .....	23
4. Assessment and Accountability Report-- <i>Karen McGee</i> .....	25
5. Math and Science Vision/Goals-- <i>Robin Dodson</i> .....	26
Exhibit 5a Math and Science Initiatives .....	27
Exhibit 5b Matrix .....	31
6. Health Professions Workforce Report-- <i>Robin Dodson</i> .....	32
a. Exhibit 6a Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee Membership List .....	34
b. Exhibit 6b Nursing Programs in Idaho Inventory .....	35
c. Exhibit 6c Nursing Education Update .....	37
▪ Family Practice Residency Update .....	
7. Social Worker/Department of Health & Welfare Letter-- <i>Robin Dodson</i> .....	38
Exhibit 7 Idaho Department of Health and Welfare April 30, 2001 Letter .....	39
8. Memorandum of Understanding (Idaho and Utah) Draft-- <i>Robin Dodson</i> .....	40
Exhibit 8 Memorandum of Understanding .....	41
9. New Program Requests .....	42
▪ Doctorate in Physical Therapy--ISU ( <i>Information Only</i> ) .....	
▪ Exhibit 9 M.S. Clinical Laboratory Sciences .....	43
10. Collaborative Funding Recommendation-- <i>Robin Dodson</i> .....	44
Exhibit 10 Recommendations .....	45
11. Intellectual Property Policy-Second Reading .....	46
Exhibit 11 Intellectual Property Policy .....	48
12. Accelerated Learning Policy-Final Reading .....	51
Exhibit 12a Accelerated Learning Policy .....	52
Exhibit 12b Accelerated Learning: Potential Addition .....	56
13. Research Center Grant Program--HERC Recommendation FY02 .....	57
Exhibit 13 On-site Evaluation Panel/HERC Recommendation .....	58

## **Subject**

### **1. Approval of Committee Minutes**

## **Motion**

To approve the following standing committees' minutes as written as consent agenda items:

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee April 19, 2001 meeting (*Exhibit 1a.*)  
Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee March 29, 2001 meeting (*Exhibit 1b.*)  
Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee April 11, 2001 meeting (*Exhibit 1c.*)  
Higher Education Research Council March 6, 2001 meeting (*Exhibit 1d.*)

Moved by\_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by\_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

## Exhibit 1a

### Unapproved Minutes of Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee

April 19, 2001 • 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Room 581

Eastern Idaho Technical College / Idaho Falls, Idaho

#### **PRESENT:**

Rod Lewis, Chair, SBOE	Karen McGee, SBOE	Blake Hall, SBOE
Marilyn Howard, SBOE	Jonathan Lawson, ISU	Jerry Gee, NIC
Daryl Jones, BSU	Dan Petersen, SDPTE	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC
DeVere Burton for Jerry Beck, CSI	Bob West, SDE	Robin Dodson, OSBE
Randy Earles, ISU, Faculty	Rita Morris, LCSC	Lynn Humphrey, OSBE
Hal Godwin, UI, Student Affairs	Brian Pitcher, UI	

#### **1. Minutes of Instruction, Research, Student Affairs Committee Meeting: March 22, 2001**

**Action:** It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee meeting held on March 22, 2001.

#### **2. Minutes of Ad hoc Committee Meetings**

##### **a. Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Meeting: February 22, 2001.**

**Action:** It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs meeting held on February 22, 2001 as written.

##### **b. Minutes of Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Meeting: March 8, 2001.**

**Action:** It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs meeting held on March 8, 2001.

#### **3. Statewide Policy Recommendations Relative to K–12 Teacher Standards**

Dr. Robin Dodson reported that Mr. Jim Hammond wished to postpone this item until June.

Ms. Karen McGee mentioned that she had met with Ms. Trudy Bishoff, chair of the Professional Standards Commission. Ms. McGee believed that the professional standards commission needs to be involved with the efforts of Idaho's MOST in order to avoid duplication and to work together.

## 4. IRSA Standing Committees

As a consequence of Board action to change its By-laws and committee structure and function, staff and the Council on Academic Affairs and Program (CAAP) completed a nine-month review of the standing committees that report to the Instruction Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee.

Both CAAP and Board staff recommended the following:

- Discontinue the Telecommunications Advisory Council with the function and charge transferred to CAAP, which has been the practice in the past several years.
- Initiate the Idaho EPSCoR external peer-review as soon as the funding is available.
- Officially discontinue the Admission Standards Committee and assign its function and charge to CAAP.
- Officially discontinue the 1996 Statewide Medical Advisory Committee and assign its function and charge to the Board's Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee.
- Statewide Engineering Education Advisory Council coordinates its reports and recommendations through CAAP prior to its official communications to IRSA.

**Action:** It was moved by Blake Hall, seconded by Karen McGee, and carried to accept the recommendation of CAAP regarding the five (5) standing committees to IRSA as noted above.

## 5. Professional Program Definitions

At IRSA's March 22, 2001 meeting, there was considerable discussion of the issues of how to define a "professional program" and the approval of a "professional fee" by the State Board of Education. As a consequence, the IRSA committee instructed CAAP to develop two options for committee consideration. These options were to be placed on the IRSA April 2001 agenda.

There was some question of the timing of the IRSA committee's recommendation to the full board and how that would impact the University of Idaho's request to the BAHF committee to charge a professional fee for its business programs. Dr. Robin Dodson responded that IRSA would discuss the professional fee definition during its committee meeting and bring a recommendation to the full Board. After the Board hears IRSA's recommendation, it will consider the UI's professional fee proposal. Mr. Rod Lewis was concerned that the issue of professional and/or differential fees was improperly placed before the IRSA committee. Dr. Dodson explained that although the professional fee is a financial affairs issue, because the policy deals with programs it also falls under the purview of the IRSA committee.

Mr. Lewis stated that the issue to be determined is whether a professional fee should be defined, and if so, should it be included in the Board's governing policies. Mr. Blake Hall added that the Board's alternative is to leave the existing policy as is and continue to consider programs on a case by case basis, adding them to the list when approved.

The CAAP presented five options for the Board to consider; however, the Council or staff has forwarded a specific recommendation with regard to the options. The committee asked the institutional representatives to briefly tell them which of the options they believe the Board should adopt.

Dr. Jonathan Lawson favored option four. He described the problem as one of how to adequately fund programs in a way that is conducive to good public policy, conducive to excellence in teaching and learning, and is fair. The matriculation fee has been inadequate for the institutions to deliver their programs (and is prohibited by Idaho's constitution). Option four suggests that the Board consider increasing the matriculation fees with an established "floor".

Dr. Rita Morris stated that LCSC is concerned with students' ability to handle the costs, but recognized the reality of the difficulty of funding high cost programs. The institutions' options to deal with inadequate funding include charging course fees and professional fees. She was not comfortable with the notion of trying to define a professional program, and believed that the Board could spend a lot of time doing that. Rather, Dr. Morris recommended a policy that sets a "floor" for matriculation fees overall, which would eliminate the class distinction by types of programs, would spread costs out among all students and allows the institutions to set their priorities. She also prefers a traditional approach to the definition of a professional program.

Dr. Jerry Gee declined to comment because of the difference in funding mechanisms between community colleges and the rest of the state higher education system.

Dr. Mary Ann Carlson agreed with the need for additional monies to fund programs. EITC is using the mechanisms available to the greatest extent possible to meet the needs of students. Dr. Carlson added that the definition is not as clear as she would like because EITC has some technical programs that require licensure for graduates.

Dr. Daryl Jones favored the narrowest historical definition of professional fees in order to prevent moving toward differential fees, which he does not support. He thought expanding the definition would have unintended consequences that are not good public policy. Dr. Jones also agreed that the real problem stems from the inadequate funding for the postsecondary institutions. He favored option four because he recognized that institutions have to increase fees in order to provide a quality education. He also noted that the Board has hired a consultant to explore the higher education funding mechanism, which may have some bearing on the question. He also stated that tying differential fees to academic programs would acknowledge in policy that the matriculation fee is tied to the cost of instruction, which could result in legal problems for the Board and the institutions.

Dr. Brian Pitcher recognized that the different perspectives of each of the intuitions reflects their unique role and mission. He observed that other states, most notably Wisconsin, also have the statutory prohibition of charging tuition and do charge a differential matriculation fee. Dr. Pitcher also agreed with the statements made by his colleagues that the fundamental issue stems from inadequate funding. He believed that the problem with the current funding approach (and option 4) is that it only allows the intuitions to fund 1/3 of the enrollment growth. He wants the Board to look at a full funding approach. Dr. Pitcher also pointed out that the consultant is looking at inequity of funding, not the adequacy of the funding. He recommended a limited differential fee with an established floor and ceiling (range) for which programs could be considered. That approach would allow for the quality of education that accreditation requires. He also reminded the committee that a professional fee is an option that is authorized by the constitution and that programs such as business and engineering are recognized in academia as professional. He suggested that the Board might also want to eliminate the full time fee and perhaps charge per credit hour.

Mr. Hall asked the institutions if they believed that the Board should define a professional fee or continue with the current practice of considering each program as it comes up.

In response, Dr. Pitcher supported option two over the first option where the Board considers requests by using the criteria set forth in option two as guidelines when deciding if a program is a professional. Boise State University does support a definition, but thinks option two is too broad. Dr. Jones favored the three criteria outlined in option one but supported leaving the “such as” clause in the definition which allows the Board the opportunity to make legitimate exceptions. That policy would prevent the opening of the door to a flood of programs.

Ms. Leah Clark-Thomas, representing UI students, said that they would like the Board to more narrowly define professional fees so that it does not lead to an expansion of programs approved to charge the fee. Higher fees would make it difficult for students to afford those expensive programs.

Dr. Robin Dodson believed that the Board must resolve two separate issues. The first is defining a professional program. The second is the matriculation fee, which could be resolved separately perhaps through a joint meeting of the fiscal and academic officers. Dr. Dodson also pointed out, with the committee members agreeing, that there may be some political backlash if the institutions and the Board continue to talk about inadequate funding when the state budget for higher education was the best in many years.

Dr. Pitcher encouraged the Board to look carefully at what has happened to the traditional distinction between public institutions and private institutions with regard to higher education funding. While the private schools are having increased access to state and federal funding for scholarships and student aid, public education institutions have had to rely more on fund raising and tuition discounting. He also added that the UI’s program would not deny access to students. He admitted that the proposal may result in a temporary 1% decrease in enrollment in the Business program but pointed out that the level of student borrowing is not directly tied to the cost of education, but to quality of life.

Mr. Hall was concerned that the UI’s plan to deal with limited access by providing scholarships to economically disadvantaged students to cover the costs of the increased professional fee simply shuffles the same total amount of money around. He wondered if the net result would actually be more funds for the program. In response, Dr. Pitcher explained that the UI is in the middle of a capital fund raising campaign, with one of the major categories being funds for need-based scholarships. Dr. Weyland Winstead, Institutional Budgeting and Planning at UI, added that in addition to need-based scholarships, the Board could authorize the institutions to waive all or a portion of the differential fee (capped at a certain amount or percentage) to those students who have substantial financial need. That would still allow the institutions to capture the additional revenue that would go into the professional program from those students in the program who can afford it. In response to Mr. Hall’s question about the percentage of students in the professional programs who would need financial assistance or a waiver, Dr. Winstead stated that in the case of business there has been no study conducted to determine how many students would qualify for assistance and those who could afford the higher fee. However, at the UI about 10% of all students qualify for need-based financial aid because they have high levels of unmet need. The vast majority of the students at the UI can afford to pay higher tuition.

Dr. Pitcher stated that the intent of UI’s request to charge a professional fee for upper division business students is to provide additional funds to provide the quality of education that is required for the program to meet accreditation standards. They plan to redesign the curriculum and continue to

maintain a student-faculty ratio as required by accreditation, which is very expensive. The anticipated enrollment growth of the program will require the addition of new business faculty; consequently, a portion of the professional fee will go to support business faculty salaries because of their relatively low compensation and the difficulty in recruiting business faculty. Dr. Winstead added that a differential matriculation fee couldn't support faculty salaries; however higher matriculation fees could be applied towards facilities and other appropriate costs, freeing up institutional funds for faculty support and quality programs.

With regard to a comment made about how the public institutions are operating more and more like the private education model, Dr. Marilyn Howard stated that she was concerned that the state is operating under a false image of what the higher education system truly is. She wondered if the system is changing but the thinking is not, and what the consequences for students will be. We are trying to promote an image of a high quality education from the public institutions and that is what the public expects. Dr. Howard predicted that students who know they may be faced with a professional fee will pursue their general education requirements first and delaying their choice of majors in order to hold down costs. She thought the questions being considered are part of a larger issue.

In response to Ms. Karen McGee's question about what would happen to the program if it were not approved for a professional fee, Dr. Pitcher said that UI would be faced with the question of having to limit enrollment or considering other sources to reallocate funding. Dr. Winstead added that the alternative for the President and Provost to consider is an across-the-board increase in the matriculation fee. Dr. Hal Godwin mentioned that from a recruiting perspective, the UI is in direct competition with private institutions and the UI's ability to offer high quality programs at a lower cost gives them the advantage, and there is still a big gap in price between the UI's professional programs and academic programs offered by the private schools.

Board members wondered whether under the situation of limited resources Idaho institutions could afford to have the best programs in every field. "Pocket of excellence" in specialized areas is preferable than trying to be all things to all people. They were also concerned about the wisdom of providing scholarships to make up a deficiency created by increasing fees.

Mr. Casey Swisher, a student at the University of Idaho, addressed the Board and suggested that the UI look to increased corporate sponsorship to find funding support. He also believed that cost is the major factor students consider when deciding where to attend school and increased professional fees will put UI at a competitive disadvantage. He also mentioned that if approved, the professional fee coupled with the other increased student fees would push students up into a new financial aid bracket, but not enough to qualify them for Pell grants or other subsidized loans.

Dr. Brian Pitcher shared with the committee a resolution from the co-chairs of the College of Business and Economics Dean's Student Advisory Board supporting the implementation of professional fees in the College of Business and Economics.

Mr. Lewis concluded the discussion by stating that he believed that the committee had come to the consensus that there are two issues that must be addressed separately. One issue is establishing a definition of a professional program and the other is differing matriculation fees. The committee agreed that the definition of a professional program should be decided from among options one and two. Mr. Blake Hall favored option one that is narrowly drawn with flexibility to consider other

factors. Ms. Karen McGee leaned toward a combination of options one and two because of the flexibility they would provide. Dr. Marilyn Howard suggested that a version of option one, with flexible language “such as” would be an acceptable short-term approach to the bigger issue of truth in cost. Mr. Lewis agreed with Dr. Howard. Consequently, the committee instructed CAAP to bring a proposed professional program definition to the June 2001 Board meeting for IRSA’s consideration and action.

With regard to differential matriculation fees, IRSA directed CAAP to provide a more thorough presentation and brief from the relative parties in support of and opposed to differential fees to include examples of universities and states that have implemented differing fees, what the impact has been in those schools and states, an analysis of the relevant issues in Idaho, and the impact if that fee structure were implemented in Idaho. IRSA requested the analysis for consideration at its August 2001 meeting. It is expected that the Board will not act on the proposals until the fall.

The committee agreed that the Board would default to the historical practice when considering the UI’s professional fee request for its business programs.

## **6. Math and Science Goals**

Mr. Rod Lewis stated that the CAAP did a good job at the last meeting of identifying the issues and articulating the secondary goals for math and science education. However, he thought the Board still had not established its overall goal, whether it be the broad scope of increasing math and science education, or focused towards having more students select careers in those professions that require more math and science preparation.

Dr. Robin Dodson asked for direction from the committee on what it believes the vision/goal should be. Once that has been established, Dr. Dodson and his colleagues could begin to develop appropriate strategies. The two options for Board consideration were as follows:

1. All Idaho K-16 students will attain mathematics and science competency and be challenged to achieve to their greatest abilities in order to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
2. The state's vibrant technology-based economy will depend upon student success in selecting careers in engineering, computer science, health professions, and related disciplines, which all depend upon a sound foundation in the principles and understanding of mathematics and science.

After a brief discussion the committee agreed that the two visions presented were complementary, and not that much different. They liked the vision of all Idaho K-16 students attaining mathematics and science competencies, but did not want the end result of students prepared to select careers in the above mentioned disciplines get lost.

In order to coordinate efforts, Mr. Lewis asked Dr. Dodson to contact the Governor’s office and the other committees currently working on math and science education to determine what those committees’ work involves including their timeframes for developing recommendations and implementation. The committee wanted to avoid duplication of efforts by combining the work of the various groups into a single committee if possible.

## **7. Achievement Standards Report**



This item was deferred until committee reports to the Board later in the day.

## **8. Assessment Standards Report**

Ms. Karen McGee deferred the assessment standards report to committee reports but she did mention that representatives from other states who have implemented assessment programs for standards will be at the May 8-9, 2001 meeting and that all were welcome to attend.

## **9. Nursing Education Issues**

Dr. Daryl Jones reported that Boise State University administrators met with Ms. Sandra Bruce and Mr. Edward Dahlberg, CEOs of the regional medical centers in Boise. As a response to the immediate crisis of the nursing shortage, BSU intends to increase its nursing programs by 30 students in fall 2001. CSI, LCSC and EITC are expanding their programs as well.

Ms. McGee mentioned that at the Health Professions Workforce (HPWF) meeting it was noted that some areas of the state still have capacity in its nursing programs. She encouraged the institutions to work together to increase the delivery of programs. Boise State is focusing on the associate and baccalaureate level and Idaho State is expanding programs at the graduate level. Idaho State University also offered to help with the other levels as appropriate.

Mr. Hall pointed out that the institutions' plan to increase the number of seats by 30 students will not be adequate to address the nursing shortage. In response, the committee instructed CAAP to work with the HPWF committee to report back to IRSA at the June meeting how to address the hospitals' concerns.

## **10. Social Worker Issues**

Dr. Robin Dodson reported that it was recently learned that for the past several years the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare has been contracting with Eastern Washington University (EWU) for social worker services. Currently, the contract is \$929,171 per year. Further, the annual renewal contract states that EWU will provide services that address child welfare training activities, research and program evaluation, and an MSW stipend (Title IV E Program).

Dr. Daryl Jones explained that a former BSU faculty member left the state and began working for EWU and managed to garner the contract during a time of transition for Boise State. BSU's Department of Social Work has reviewed the RFP and can and will do everything in the contract. In addition, LCSC and NIC are interested in providing some of those services.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Blake Hall, seconded by Ms. Karen McGee, and approved to send a letter from the Board to the Department of Health and Welfare encouraging them to enter in a social worker services contract with Idaho institutions rather than out-of-state institutions.

## **11. Program Changes approved by Executive Director**

In accordance with Board policy, postsecondary program components (e.g., majors, minors, emphasis, and options), changes in title or units (e.g., department, schools, colleges, etc.) and routine changes (e.g., addition, discontinuance, semester offerings, catalog changes, etc.) may be approved by the Executive Director of the Board; however, these changes require Board Approval if the fiscal

impact is greater than \$150,000 per year. Those changes approved by the Executive Director from November 1, 2000 - March 31, 2001 were reported to the Board.

## **12. Program Approval**

In accordance with Board policy, all new academic and professional-technical programs must have full Board approval prior to implementation or inclusion in the SBOE's fiscal year budget request. The CAAP has evaluated the new program requests as established in its guidelines on program review (i.e., quality, centrality, duplication, demand, and resources) and recommends the approval of the notices of intent outlined below without the development of full proposals.

- a. Associate of Applied Science, Division of Office and Business Technology--Web Development by LCSC
- b. Associate of Applied Science, Advanced Technical Certificate, Agri-Business Technology -- Landscape Management Technician by EITC
- c. Associate of Applied Science, Technical Certificate, Department of Professional-Technical Education at CSI
- d. Associate of Applied Science, Technical Certificate, Department of Agriculture at CSI

**Action:** It was moved by Karen McGee, seconded by Blake Hall, and carried to recommend to the full Board approval of those new program outlined above.

## **13. First Reading Accelerated Learning Policy**

Dr. Robin Dodson pointed out the proposed changes to the accelerated learning policy and noted that there may be some additional changes between the first and final readings. Dr. DeVere Burton suggested that the types of dual enrollment programs be more clearly defined as the policy has with the tech prep programs. Mr. Lewis also requested that CAAP work on 5d, last bullet, to clarify the intent of that provision.

**Action:** It was moved by Blake Hall, seconded by Karen McGee, and carried to approve for first reading the changes to the Board's Accelerated Learning Policy as exhibited in Item 13.

## **14. First Reading--Intellectual Property Policy**

The Board has had intellectual property rules for a number of years. This legislative session, the Board successfully requested that the administrative rules on Intellectual Property be repealed, thus allowing the Board to govern personnel matters by policy rather than rule. The repeal of this rule is effective on July 1, 2001.

In drafting the initial revisions, each agency and institution formed a committee to review the intellectual property policies. Then, each agency and institution sent a representative to be a member of the Statewide Intellectual Property Review Committee.

The goal of the statewide committee was to streamline and fold the rules into the policy. Mr. Kevin Satterlee sought input from the Board to determine if the committee is headed in the right direction

with the Board's draft intellectual property policy. At Mr. Satterlee's suggestion, the Board agreed to further discuss the intellectual property and its other pending policies during its May retreat and policy summit. Dr. Randy Earles stated that faculty had some concerns with the policy as written and wondered if they would have an opportunity to provide input. The Board members assured him that the Board would take no action in May.

Mr. Rod Lewis had some concerns about the significance of the policy and proposed that the committee defer the first reading action. He identified some very fundamental issues that need more discussion, such as who owns the intellectual property that is developed at the universities. He believed a case could be made that the state paid for it so it (or the Board) ought to own it. On the other hand, he understood that universities and/or faculty want to retain the intellectual property as part of their compensation. Disclosure, filing, rights, and work for hire are other issues that must have serious consideration before the Board takes action on the policy. In addition, Mr. Lewis also would like to know how much money is being made and how it is made. He also mentioned that he was troubled by having to pay taxes to have intellectual property developed that faculty or the institution then tries to charge for when funds are given to the institutions to develop programs in the first place.

Dr. Jonathan Lawson informed the committee that the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) has not endorsed the proposed intellectual property policy.

In response to Mr. Lewis' concerns, Mr. Satterlee stated that if the policy changes were delayed until after the June Board meeting, temporary administrative rules could be written to extend the repealed rules until the policy is in place.

**Action:** It was moved by Blake Hall, seconded by Karen McGee, and carried to recommend tabling the modification to the SBOE's Intellectual Property Policy.

## **15. Technology Incentive Grant Program--Funded Proposals**

The Idaho Technology Incentive Grant (ITIG) program was created in 1997, and has funded 34 projects at a total of \$7 million. The Board requested \$1.7 million from the Legislature for FY 2002 for continued funding of this competitive program to foster innovative learning approaches using technology. Of that amount, \$250,200 is committed to previously approved projects, and should be honored.

Working with the Presidents and Provosts, staff developed a revised grant proposal that focuses upon enhanced student learning, faculty development, technology in the curriculum and increased access to education programs. An evaluation committee consisting of a representative from the IRSA Committee, the BAHF Committee, ITRMC, the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Technology Officer met March 26, 2001 to evaluate the proposals and recommends funding the grant proposals as exhibited in Item 15.

**Action:** It was moved by Blake Hall, seconded by Karen McGee, and carried to recommend approval to fund the Idaho Technology Grant Program proposals as exhibited in Item 15.

## **16. Other**

Mr. Blake Hall requested that Dr. Dodson provide to the board at its next meeting a copy of the protocol that has been worked out between Utah State University and Idaho State University on dual enrollment issues. He thought that protocol could be used as a model for the other state universities.

## Exhibit 1b.

### Minutes

## Council on Academic Affairs and Programs

March 29, 2001 • 9:30 am – 3:30 pm  
PTE Conference Room 324 • Boise, Idaho

<b>Present:</b>	Jerry Beck, CSI	Brian Pitcher, UI	Mike Falconer, SDPTE
	Daryl Jones, BSU	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	Bob West, SDOE
	Jonathan Lawson, ISU via phone	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC	Robin Dodson, OSBE
	Jerry Gee, NIC	Dan Petersen, SDPTE	Patty Sanchez, OSBE

**Guest:** Patty Toney, Idaho's MOST

### 1. Minutes of February 22, 2001 CAAP Meeting

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2001 meeting with amendments to page 1, to add Mary Ann Carlson to the list of those in attendance at the meeting and to page 2 third paragraph, third sentence to read *"Essentially, it was agreed to have the institution's Chief Academic Officer compose a "hardship" letter to the State Board of Education explaining their situation, and stating the importance of the grant and their need to utilize funds as a stipend in order to complete the project."*

### 2. Minutes of March 8, 2001 CAAP Special Meeting

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2001 meeting.

### 3. Notices of Intent:

- a. Name change, School of Applied Technology to College of Technology--ISU
- b. Associate of Applied Science---Office and Business Technology--LCSC
  - Web Development
- c. Associate of Applied Science--AgriBusiness Technology--EITC
  - Landscape Management Technician--20-Month AAS & 20-Month Advanced Technical Certificate
- d. Associate of Applied Science--Professional-Technical Division--CSI
  - Education Technician--24 month AAS Degree and 12-18 month Technical Certificate
  - Associate Teacher--24 month AAS Degree and 12-18 month Technical Certificate
  - Special Needs Para Educator--24 month AAS Degree and 12-18 month Technical Certificate
- e. Associate of Applied Science--Horticulture Program--CSI
  - Horticulture Program will offer an 18-month AAS Degree and 9-month Technical Certificate
- f. Joint Ph.D. Degree--College of Natural Resources and College of Agriculture--UI and Centro Agronomico Tropical de Investigacion y Enzenanza (CATIE)

Dan Petersen expressed concern regarding the review process of the NOI from LCSC to offer an AAS in Web Development. While there was no main concern with LCSC's program request, there was an oversight and SDPTE did not get an opportunity to review the NOI prior to the CAAP meeting. A discussion ensued regarding the review process of program requests and how they should be channeled. CAAP agreed that one copy of the NOI would be submitted to the Board office. The Board office would forward program requests to SDPTE and once approved at the Board office level, the Board office will instruct institutions to provide copies to CAAP if needed. The SDPTE will continue to prepare the copies to CAAP as well as to the ICTL.

**It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board approval of the above notices of intent without the development of full proposals. These notices of intent will be considered at the Board's April 19-20, 2001 meeting.**

#### **4. Update--Review/Modify IRSA Program Guidelines**

Robin directed CAAP to the IRSA Program Guidelines for Program Approval document and asked that they evaluate and forward any suggestions/comments on these guidelines to the Board office by April 30, 2001. He added that he would like to complete modifications to this manual by June of this year.

#### **5. Dual Enrollment/Concurrent Enrollment Report on Meeting in Utah**

Robin directed the Council to the Board's policy on Accelerated Learning Program and outlined draft modifications. A particular focal point was the language for the *Adjunct Faculty Qualifications*. He also discussed with CAAP an issue/concern with the policy as it relates to fees and thought it would be a good idea to look at this area as well.

Robin noted that there is a meeting being held at ISU next week with Jonathan Lawson, Mike Peterson, Stan Albright, and Blake Hall to discuss with the Utah State Board of Regents concurrent enrolled programs. Robin also noted that he is collecting data on what other states are doing in regards to concurrent enrollment programs and plans to do an executive summary.

A brief discussion ensued regarding tech-prep and its validity for being placed in policy as a concurrent/dual enrolled program. CAAP agreed to leave it in the draft policy as a separate item under definitions.

Robin distributed a copy of short-term and long-term plans that he drafted for accelerated learning dual enrollment/concurrent enrollment issues and outlined briefly the proposed plan and action steps. It was suggested that the distance education that Utah State is offering be addressed in the plan as it seems to be a particular point Melvin Buetler continues to raise.

A discussion ensued regarding the issue of student preparedness and dual enrollment. CAAP addressed the need for a meeting to occur between the Council and selected superintendents regarding dual enrollment issues to understand both sides and perceptions. Robin agreed and reemphasized the need to meet with the six regions (school districts) superintendents to explain and clarify the Board's policy and to receive their feedback on these and other issues. He added that he has asked Mike Friend of the Idaho Education Association to facilitate this meeting.

CAAP expressed concerns with the Board's comparisons of Achievement Standards to that of college admission standards. The Board has referred to the two standards as the same in past meetings. CAAP felt there needs to be more discussion on this issue with the Board. It was suggested that this be placed on the next IRSA agenda with a document that would make some reference to the connection to the two but that one does not necessarily equate to other. Robin suggested that it would be more valuable and logical to include such information in the Admission Standards Policy.

## **6. Report Card Title II Update--Bob West**

Dr. Bob West provided CAAP with an update on the Title II Report Card. On March 20, 2001, a memorandum was sent to all Education Deans explaining that certain information needs to be submitted to the State Department of Education as of April 7, 2001. To clear up any confusion, Dr. West explained that the data from the institutions of higher education (Appendix C), needs to be summarized and submitted individually. He added that although the state has no standards, Idaho is still meeting federal expectations. Dr. West shared with CAAP a *Reporting Schedule* and summarized data that needs to be reported to the USDOE by October 2001.

Daryl Jones suggested that any future correspondence relating to the Title II Report Card directed to Deans be copied to the Provosts so they are able to follow-up and ensure that the information requested/due is being responded to and that statistical information reported is correct. Daryl also suggested that it would be helpful to have a brief two paragraph update provided that could serve as a common statement to respond to the media statewide to ensure that everyone is sharing the same information. Dr. West offered to generate a paragraph description to serve as an update and press release for staff to use for communicating with the media if needed.

## **7. Grow Your Own Update--Lynn Humphrey**

A discussion ensued regarding the "Grow Your Own" project. CAAP felt that they should be a part of the discussion on how the monies would be used and expressed concern that they have not been consulted nor asked to participate in discussions or meetings. Robin informed CAAP that Lynn Humphrey attended an impromptu meeting yesterday, which was held in the Board office and led by Dr. Greg Fitch, Executive Director. At Robin's request, Ms. Humphrey briefly reported on that meeting for CAAP.

Lynn Humphrey reported that a meeting was held with Sam Bird, Hector deLeon, Irene Chavolla, Jerry Beck, and Bill Rudd of the Governor's Office. The intent was to get some clarification from Mr. Rudd of the Governor's intent with regard to the amount of the scholarship and whether some of the award can be used for faculty or mentoring type support for students involved in the program. She added that a letter of intent is expected from the Governor's office and once that letter is received, Dr. Fitch plans to send a letter to all those who were part of the task force to notify them of the parameters of the scholarship and how it will be implemented. Dr. Fitch will be requesting that they report to the Board office by a certain date of their intent to participate.

Ms. Humphrey briefly shared with CAAP the eligibility requirements that were determined at this meeting. CAAP expressed interest in having a role in setting up the guidelines in how this is going to be implemented.

## **8. Math/Science Preparation - SBOE Directions**

Robin Dodson directed the Council to the Math and Science documents drafted by Trudy Anderson for CAAP's review and discussion. He informed CAAP that he invited Dr. Patty Toney of Idaho's MOST to discuss the issues they have addressed to compare those issues that CAAP has already addressed with Math and Science as the Board does not have a clear understanding of what has been accomplished and by whom.

Dr. Toney informed CAAP that there are several items noted on the *Mathematics and Science Initiative* document that Idaho's MOST has addressed in the math and science area and explained how these items are covered in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification and Professional School Staff*. She added that there will be a forecast report of the supply, demand, retention and recruitment issues of teachers coming out in early summer that may be helpful in regards to "adequate supply" of *qualified teachers* in the document.

A series of discussions ensued regarding the drafted goals and fundamentally, CAAP agreed to accept and forward these goals to IRSA at their next meeting. However, CAAP expressed concerns with the goals primarily emphasizing on math and science leaving other disciplines like Art and Humanities unaddressed. CAAP felt it important to ensure it does not get over balanced. Robin offered to rework the some of the goal items.

Robin noted that the strategies do not have to be ready until June but asked CAAP to review document and be prepared to discuss at the next CAAP meeting.

## **9. IRSA Standing Committees Review/Recommendations**

Robin directed CAAP to the IRSA standing committees document and outlined the options and recommendations he drafted for discussion. A discussion ensued regarding SEEAC and the options for consideration. CAAP suggested forwarding a recommendation to IRSA to have SEEAC report through CAAP as there may be program issues. Robin offered to talk to Rod Lewis and Jim Coleman, current Chair of SEEAC, to obtain their views and recommendations. With the exception of SEEAC, CAAP agreed to forward those recommendations to IRSA as drafted by Robin.

## **10. Professional Program--Definition**

Robin summarized the professional program discussion that occurred at the March 22, 2001 IRSA meeting and noted that the Board felt there needs to be input by students and the public with the pros and cons of each option listed. He reminded CAAP that IRSA instructed them to develop two options for their consideration. He directed CAAP to the professional fees document that he drafted for discussion and outlined the options.

After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that an additional option should be added regarding differential fees with a list of pros and cons for IRSA's review. It was recommended that Robin compile a comprehensive series of options with the pros and cons listed for each with a possible third option on differential fees. CAAP offered to forward their pros and cons list to Robin who will assemble a master list and send out for comment.



## **11. Intellectual Property Policy**

Robin directed the Committee to a draft of the Intellectual Property Policy. This is simply for information purposes and no action was needed.

## **12. Admission Policy**

Robin directed CAAP to the Admissions Policy document and asked CAAP for any further changes/concerns before forwarding to the Board for final reading. He mentioned that the only recommendation he received was to frame the language for the English in the same way as the Math text and table. Several members of CAAP expressed concern with the score for Math 144/160 and 170. CAAP felt this needed to be researched more and will have Math Chairs discuss this issue and report directly to Robin as soon as possible but before the April 11, 2001 CAAP meeting.

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.**

## Exhibit 1c.

### Minutes

## Council on Academic Affairs and Programs

April 11, 2001 • 9:30 am – 3:30 pm  
LBJ Basement Conference • Boise, Idaho

<b>Present:</b>	Jerry Beck, CSI	Jerry Gee, NIC	Bob West, SDOE
	Daryl Jones, BSU	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	Robin Dodson, OSBE
	Jonathan Lawson, ISU	Mike Falconer, SDPTE	Patty Sanchez, OSBE

**Absent:** Mary Ann Carlson, EITC  
Brian Pitcher, UI  
Dan Petersen, SDPTE  
Nancy Szofran, OSBE

### 1. Notice of Intent:

- a. Master of Science, College of Arts and Sciences--ISU
  - Clinical Laboratory Science

Dr. Jonathan Lawson shared with the Committee ISU's intent to offer a Masters of Science degree in the College of Arts and Sciences for Clinical Laboratory Science. This program is building on the existing bacculerate program.

A consensus was reached to forward this notice of intent in preparation for a full proposal to the full Board for its consideration at a future CAAP/SBOE meeting.

### 2. Professional Programs--Options

Robin Dodson reminded CAAP of the Board charge given to the Council to come up with professional program options for the Board's review at their next meeting. He directed the Council to the *Professional Program Options document* and outlined the three options he drafted from the Board's discussion at their last Board meeting.

A discussion ensued regarding the options and the concerns with cost issues and legislative consequences should the Board take action to adopt one of the options. Robin informed CAAP that the Board's Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee and the Presidents' Council would be conducting an external review study of the financing of Idaho's higher education system. Robin felt that it would be beneficial to forward a recommendation to hold this issue until the Board's funding study is complete. Robin offered to rework the options and make a recommendation for IRSA's consideration on this document that suggests to IRSA that they table the issue until the funding study is complete.

### **3. Math and Science Goals**

Robin informed the Council that he met with Board member Rod Lewis on the issue of math and science education. He directed the Council to the *Math and Science Initiatives document* that he drafted as a result of that discussion. Robin informed CAAP that Mr. Lewis felt the initial direction CAAP was taking to develop math and science goals on the basis for all students K-16 was not consistent with certain industrial/business stakeholders. Mr. Lewis felt that CAAP should be also examining a different direction/options with the goals and targeting students entering into those fields that require significant math and science preparation. Robin asked CAAP for their input on the direction to take with this charge. CAAP suggested that they present the Board with the two visions and their goals and request clarification from IRSA and the Board on the direction they wish to take with the math and science goals.

### **4. Accelerated Learning Policy Changes**

Robin Dodson directed the Council to the *Accelerated Learning Policy draft* and noted that he has not made any changes from the last CAAP meeting. Robin briefly summarized the meeting with Utah that occurred in Pocatello (ISU) on April 6, 2001. He distributed a document for CAAP's information on *university acceptance of regional schools* that was distributed by Mike Petersen during his presentation at the meeting. He added that Utah has a formed committee comprised of the Board office, Provosts, and superintendents that meet every two months to frame policy and make recommendations to their Board of Regents. He thought this was valuable and may be worth looking into. He again emphasized the need to have CAAP meet with the six educational regions.

A discussion ensued regarding accelerated learning programs and the information that should be directed to parents and their students from institutions. CAAP recommended that an additional item be added to the policy to include information on transferability of credits earned; impact on GPA from college credits earned; and probability of scholarship opportunities impacted by concurrent enrolled credits.

A brief discussion ensued regarding tech-prep. Mike Falconer felt that a sentence should be added to the second paragraph, last sentence of page two to read "*However, they are considered to be an accelerated learning program that may result in college credit and hence are included in this policy.*" CAAP had no concerns with that added language.

### **5. Intellectual Property Policy**

Robin briefed the Council on the meeting that was held regarding the Intellectual Property Policy yesterday. He briefly outlined some of the changes made to the policy and noted that although they have been working with a tight timeframe, the policy should be in place by July 1, 2001.

CAAP shared several concerns regarding the Intellectual Property Policy and had reservations about making any recommendations for Board approval. Robin encouraged CAAP to share their concerns with the Board at their April Board meeting.

## **6. Admission Policy**

Robin directed CAAP to the *Admission policy* and outlined some additional changes that were made. Jerry Beck distributed a document on *COMPASS Math Test scores* with CAAP and shared concerns with COMPASS domain and how the scores do not seem to correlate with the ACT, SAT, and COMPASS cut-off scores in Board's policy. CAAP suggested that the COMPASS Math domain issue be addressed by the Math Chairs and thought it would be valuable to have them attend a future CAAP meeting.

Due to several revisions that need to be made and the concerns with the math scores, CAAP recommended to table this issue and not forward to IRSA until CAAP can revisit this issue in-depth with the Math Chairs from the seven institutions.

## **7. Other**

A brief discussion ensued regarding the statewide statement on the Title II Report Card. The SDE and OSBE will draft the success rates prohibition, rework the language, and check with the Deans on the status before bringing through CAAP.

**The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.**

## Exhibit 1d.

### UNAPPROVED MINUTES HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL MEETING

March 6, 2001

LBJ Building, Boise, ID - Room 324 / 11:30 pm – 11:45 pm

**Present:**

Darrell Manning, Chair	Richard Bowen	Chuck Ruch	Dennis Stevens
Ron Bitner	Bob Hoover	Niel Zimmerman	Lynn Humphrey

**Absent:** Bill Shipp                      John Huffman                      Robin Dodson

#### **I. Minutes of December 5, 2000**

**MSC(Hoover/Ruch): To approve the minutes of February 6, 2001.**

#### **II. Results of RCGP Mail Review**

Ms. Lynn Humphrey explained to the Council that in accordance with HERC policy five (5) peer reviewers approved by the HERC evaluated each proposal submitted to the FY02 Research Center Grant Program. The lowest of the 5 scores was dropped and the remaining 4 scores were averaged to determine a final score.

HERC program guidelines state that the three top-ranking proposals from the stage one (1) mail review and approved by HERC will advance to an on-site visit by a review panel consisting of three peer reviewers from the first stage (one per project) and four research administrators.

The highest-ranking proposal received a final score of 9.38 and the second highest-ranking proposal received a final score of 9.00. The issue is that three (3) proposals have all earned the same score of 8.75, resulting in a three-way tie for the 3<sup>rd</sup> spot. HERC has no mechanism in place to break a tie so members must decide which proposals will advance to the stage two (2) on-site evaluation to be held the week of April 30, 2001.

Board staff presented some options that were briefly discussed by the Council.

**MSC(Zimmerman/Hoover): To approve the inclusion of the 5<sup>th</sup> and lowest score that was dropped in the calculations to determine which of the three proposals tied for 3<sup>rd</sup> place will advance to the stage 2 site review.**

At the conclusion of the vote, Ms. Humphrey distributed score reports that summarized the final results of the FY 02 RCGP mail review and identified the three top scoring proposal to advance to the on-site evaluation as follows:

1. Northwest Information Assurance Research Partnership, UI
2. Idaho Accelerator Center, ISU
3. The Center for Biogeochemical Systems Research, UI

**The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.**

## **Subject**

### **2. Idaho's MOST Update—Jim Hammond and Patty Toney**

#### **Review / Coordination Function – Idaho's MOST Advisory Group**

**Background:** In 1998, the Idaho State Board of Education created the Idaho's MOST initiative to aggressively pursue improving teacher quality in the state's K-12 classrooms. Teacher quality was singled out because research has repeatedly demonstrated that other than family factors, improved teaching is the most effective way to improve student progress/achievement. The MOST Advisory Group, chaired by a Board member and composed of a diverse group of business leaders and educators (including the Superintendent of Public Instruction), has directed the MOST activities since the onset of the initiative. There have been many accomplishments to date and soon there will be many additional teacher policy recommendations from the MOST Advisory Group to the Board. Since MOST's inception, the Board has also continued to receive teacher policy recommendations from a variety of other policy groups that include the Professional Standards Commission (PSC), education stakeholder professional associations, the Idaho Department of Education, etc.

**Discussion:** It has been recommended that Idaho's MOST Advisory Group be given the opportunity to review and comment on all statewide teacher policy recommendations related to the K-12 teacher standards, teacher preparation programs, teacher professional development, teacher evaluation/compensation, teacher recruitment and retention, and teacher certification and re-certification prior to Board action on these recommendations. This was recommended because Idaho's MOST is entering a critical policy formulation phase and there is the potential for statewide teacher policy recommendations coming from sources other than MOST to become fragmented or to be even at cross-purposes with policy formulation activities of the Board's MOST Advisory Group. While good teacher policy ideas can come from any number of places, it becomes critically important that the MOST Advisory Group be given an opportunity to review and comment on all statewide teacher policy. This will not preclude non-MOST policy recommendations from being forwarded to the Board, but only ensure that the MOST Advisory Group is aware of the other relevant initiatives and recommendations in the area of teacher policy. It is not intended that the MOST Advisory Group would have the authority to approve or reject proposals from other groups, but simply the opportunity to review and comment on proposals in the interest of coordination and avoiding duplication.

**Impact:** Forwarding all issues relative to the K-12 teacher standards, teacher preparation programs, teacher professional development, teacher evaluation/compensation, teacher recruitment and retention, and teacher certification and re-certification through the Idaho's MOST Advisory Committee before routing to the Board would serve to coordinate these activities, alleviate fragmentation of policies in this area, and provide an opportunity for the various stakeholder and advisory groups to collaborate and cooperate in the development of recommendations to the Board on teacher related policies. The Board will remain the final approval authority on these matters.

**Fiscal Impact:** None.

**Motion:** This item is for discussion only at this point. No Board action is intended.

## **Subject**

### **3. Achievement Standards Update—Lydia Guerra**

#### **Background and Discussion**

The K-8 Humanities Standards Subcommittee has met to develop the K-8 Humanities Standards. The K-8 Humanities Standards will compliment the 9-12 Humanities Standards, which were not changed for K-8. The content knowledge and skills were made grade appropriate. Several Idaho teachers from different grade levels were brought in to write the K-8 Humanities Standards. The focus of the Committee was to focus on the students to develop a basic understanding of the humanities disciplines. In order to achieve success, a student of the humanities must gain content knowledge, practice critical thinking skills, and experience personal expression throughout each grade level.

These varied courses of study hold one concept in common: they all attempt to explain in distinctive ways what it means to be human. In addition, student's literate in the humanities should:

- Become fully empowered to explore human work and individual destiny.
- Gain tools that aid them in analyzing the claims of others and making reasoned judgments.
- Possess the potential to face their futures with essential strengths.

More importantly, students who communicate in another language, create a musical sound, provide a dramatic experience, value of work of art, or develop a new idea can more profoundly enjoy life.

The K-8 Humanities Standards offer a framework for student achievement in the humanities. Four committees of content specialists, business and minority representatives, and educational professionals helped to develop the Humanities Standards. Over 75 people represented all regions of Idaho; they volunteered their time and expertise. Various courses within the humanities are organized into four groups:

- Interdisciplinary Humanities
- Visual and Performing Arts
- World History
- Foreign Language

#### **History Timeline Humanities grades K-8**

##### **Statewide Committee (10-15 teachers)**

##### **March 20-21, 2001 (Statewide Committee) Grades 6-8**

Music, Art

##### **May 4, 2001 (Statewide Committee) Grades 6-8**

Drama, Foreign Language

##### **May 10-11, 2001 (Statewide Committee) Grades 4-5**

Music, Art

### **3. Achievement Standards Update—Lydia Guerra--continued**

#### **Upcoming Meetings**

##### **June 14, 2001 (Statewide Committees)**

Drama, Foreign Language (**Grades K-5**)

Music, Art (**Grades K-3**)

Dance (**Grades K-8**)

##### **June 15, 2001 (Statewide Committees) Grades K-3**

Drama, Foreign Language (**Grades K-5**)

Music, Art (**Grades K-3**)

Dance (**Grades K-8**)

#### **Other Meetings:**

Math and Science Alignment is scheduled for June 11-12, 2001. The Achievement Standards Commission will review the K-8 Math and Science Standards. This review is prompted by the findings of the TIMSS (Third International Math and Science Study). In particular, the TIMSS results suggest that top scoring countries tend to teach fewer subjects each academic year but in greater depth. While the Idaho K-8 Achievement Standards are reflective of the NAS Benchmarks (Science) and NCTM (Math) recommendations we are concerned that our standards may still suffer from a lack of focus and excessive coverage.

#### **Impact**

The Humanities Standards K-8 will compliment and provide a foundation for students in the earlier years to meet the Humanities Standards established for students in grades 9-12.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

No fiscal impact at this time.

#### **Motion**

None at this time.

#### **Attachments**

None



## **Subject**

### **4. Assessment and Accountability Report—Karen McGee**

## **Background and Discussion**

The Idaho State Board of Education Assessment and Accountability Commission has developed the first Draft of the comprehensive plan for the State of Idaho.

The State Board Assessment and Accountability Commission reviewed comments and issues throughout the state regarding how to best measure student achievement and mastery of Idaho's Achievement Standards. The Statewide Assessment Inquiry Summary report is available on the Internet for public information and will be printed for your packet. The Commission was sincere in reviewing all comments and information on what is working, what is not working, what schools or districts would like to see in an accountability system, and what costs have been incurred in schools or districts relating to assessment. Over 130 educators participated to help the Commission design a successful assessment and accountability system in order to help students achieve a higher level and improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of public education. Standards, Assessment and Accountability provide policymakers, educators, parents, and the public a means to monitor, measure and continuously improve student achievement and school quality.

A PowerPoint presentation will be given at this meeting to present the Draft Comprehensive Assessment Plan.

## **Next Assessment Commission Meetings**

**June 18, 2001, Boise**

**Afternoon – Owyhee Plaza**

**8:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

**June 19, 2001 Boise**

**Owyhee Plaza**

**8:15 a.m. – 4:15 p.m.**

**July 11, 2001 Boise**

**Legislative Work Session**

**Location - TBD**

**8:15 a.m. – 4: 15 p.m.**

**July 12, 2001 Boise**

**Assessment Commission Meeting with Legislative Work Session**

**Location - TBD**

**8:15 a.m. – 4: 15 p.m.**

**Statewide Comprehensive Assessment Plan – Open Houses**

## **Impact**

None at this time.

## **Fiscal Impact**

No fiscal impact at this time.

## **Motion**

None at this time.

## **Subject**

### **5. Math and Science Vision/Goals**

#### **Background and Discussion**

During the past six months, IRSA and CAAP have been addressing the issues, goals, and initiatives involving math and science education at the K-12 level. At the April 2001 IRSA meeting, the Committee gave consideration to the overall goals, two visions, with one focus upon increasing math and science education for all K-12 students, and a second effort toward the career preparation of students for engineering, science, and health professions. The committee agreed that the two visions were complementary. As a consequence, the Committee instructed CAAP to provide a vision statement, identification of the various on-going math and science initiatives, timeframes, recommendations, and implementation schedules. Furthermore, the Committee desired identification of duplication efforts and unmet needs. A report on that charge was to be placed on the June 2001 agenda.

#### **Impact**

The SBOE may take action to adopt the statewide vision statement for math and science. Further, the Board may desire to coordinate the various initiatives, continue to engage in curriculum strategies with the varied interested parties, direct teacher education programs, focus upon financing efforts to improve math and science education, embrace accountability strategies, etc.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

Varied depending upon the initiative, funding sources, and agency(ies) responsible.

#### **Motion**

None at this time.

#### **Attachments**

*Exhibit 5a Math and Science Initiatives*

*Exhibit 5b Matrix*



## Exhibit 5a Math and Science Initiatives

### *State Board of Education Mathematics & Science Initiative*

*Vision – Idaho’s educational system will be premier in mathematics and science preparing its graduates for success in the state’s vibrant, technology-based 21<sup>st</sup> Century economy.*

#### **Goals –**

- ❑ All Idaho K-16 students will attain mathematics and science competency and be challenged to achieve to their greatest abilities.
- ❑ Double the number of Idaho graduates who enter and are qualified to compete in Idaho’s technology-based industries in fields such as engineering, computer science, health professions, agriculture, biotechnology and related disciplines that place greater emphasis on the application and use of mathematics and science.
- ❑ Increase the number of qualified mathematics and science teachers to meet the demand of Idaho’s K-12 schools.

#### **Objectives –**

1. Improve student learning in science and mathematics K-12.
  - Mathematics and science instruction, congruent with standards and assessments, will be emphasized.
  - School Improvement Plans to improve knowledge and skill across the academic spectrum will emphasize math and science.
  - Mathematics and science will be introduced to more students at earlier ages. Math and science instruction at the middle school level will be enhanced by targeted staff development.
  - More mathematics and science choices and incentives for high school students, e.g., “magnet schools”, Advanced Placement, college-level coursework, high-level applied options and scholarships will be developed and implemented.
  - Mathematics and science will be better integrated into the school culture including articulation/integration with professional-technical coursework.
2. Significantly increase the number of qualified mathematics and science teachers.
  - K-12 teachers will possess subject matter knowledge suited to the grade level or program taught.
  - More professional-technical teachers will possess mathematics and science certification.
  - Additional quality routes to teaching for second career candidates with mathematics and science expertise will be implemented.
3. Enhance K-12 teacher preparation and K-16 professional development for teachers and faculty.
4. Increase partnerships with the private sector to improve mathematics and science education.
5. Raise awareness of the importance of mathematics and science to students’ success, and the need to make the teaching profession more attractive.
6. Create accountability measures to track attainment of goals.

## Complementary Efforts –

The State Board's Mathematics and Science Initiative must be designed to "fit" within the environment of educational improvements already underway in Idaho. Linking and aligning complementary efforts maximizes state resources.

Foremost among educational improvement efforts are state achievement standards and assessments for students. These efforts combined with Idaho's MOST action plan on teaching policy create focus on curriculum, teacher quality and accountability. This focus can be the uniting theme and driving force around which the State Board's mathematics and science initiative is organized.

*Focus –*  
✓ *Curriculum*  
✓ *Teacher Quality*  
✓ *Accountability*

Following are significant complementary efforts underway in Idaho. The attached graphic summarizes these efforts.

## Governor Kempthorne –

- Is convening a Governor's Math Initiative Task Force. Appointments to the task force have not yet been made. Work of this group will commence in the near future and will be conducted in conjunction with Superintendent Marilyn Howard.

## State Board of Education –

- Established standards for K-12 students in math, science, social studies, language/arts and health. Standards for grades 9-12 were approved by the Board in April 1999; by the Legislature in March 2000 and became effective July 2000. Standards for grades K-8 were approved by the Board in October 2000; by the Legislature in March 2001; and became immediately effective.
- Appointed an Assessment Commission to develop a state system of student testing in math, reading, and writing. The first class of students that will be held accountable to the statewide assessment exams in math, reading, and writing is the class of 2005. A similar state science exam is not required. (The Legislature mandated that the State Board of Education develop assessment exams for math, reading, and writing. Districts are responsible for developing their own assessment exams for science, social studies, and health. The State Board must approve these tests.)
- Charged **Idaho's MOST** (Maximizing Opportunities for Students and Teachers) to examine and recommend teacher/teaching policy revisions. Work of Idaho's MOST is not specific to mathematics and science teachers. The Idaho's MOST Advisory Group reports to the Board and operates with four sub committees: Teacher Certification Task Force, Teacher Preparation Task Force, Forecast Committee, and a Professional Development Committee.

## State Department of Education

- Places priority on use of standards and school accreditation for improvement; in-service will focus on standards and a new school accreditation process.
- Is currently developing a statewide mathematics emphasis.
- Administers the federal Eisenhower higher education and non-profit organization professional development grant program for math and science.
- Administers the State Mentor Program for new teachers.
- Administers the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

- Is analyzing Third International Math and Science Survey – Repeat (TIMSS-R) tests of Idaho 8<sup>th</sup> grade students and international counterparts.
- Jointly with State Division of Professional-Technical Education participates in Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States (V-TECS) program linking mathematics, science and language arts achievement standards.

## Technology

- Through statewide efforts, Internet access is currently present in over 90% of Idaho school districts.

## Professional Standards Commission

- Is piloting a Professional Development Model in three districts, beginning in 2001.

## State Division of Professional-Technical Education

- Supports the Tech Prep initiative that emphasizes a four-year, secondary/college articulated program of study incorporating mathematics and science skills and professional-technical coursework.
- Is implementing a “quality initiative” that emphasizes academic achievement standards, particularly mathematics and science.
- Has developed professional-technical coursework that aligns with science standards.
- Is implementing an AAS Degree for para-educators emphasizing math and science skills.

## Higher Education Institutions

Four-year institutions provide technology training for teachers in preparation for the mandated technology test; additional large technology grants at BSU and UI provide technology interaction and collaboration among university faculty, K-12 teachers and pre-service teachers for effectively using information technologies in the classroom. ISU, CSI, NIC and BSU are partnering with INEEL to deliver the JASON Project. ISU is the designated pin site (two-way communication) with network sites (one-way communication) at CSI, NIC, and BSU. Eisenhower grants from the State Department to the institutions provide science training for teachers. Dual enrollment courses offered by the institutions in cooperation with school districts are currently being reviewed.

Additional large-scale mathematics and science projects include:

- **Boise State University** – has NASA grant to promote study of science in rural schools.
- **College of Southern Idaho** – provides two annual summer science camps funded by the INEEL for elementary school children.
- **Idaho State University** – partners with INEEL to offer Teaming with Teachers annually in the summer. Museum of Natural History provides natural history science kits for schools. In addition, the Museum is involved with the National Heritage Project, which is funded by NSF for Science outreach.
- **Lewis-Clark State College** – has a NASA grant to improve mathematics and science undergraduate courses.
- **University of Idaho** – has Institute for Mathematics, Interactive Technologies and Science (IMITS), a national leader in providing programs for teachers and students, and research in science, mathematics and technology. Programs include: National Center for Online Learning Research (NCOLR), Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE), Earth System Science (ESS), Foreign Language in Elementary Science (FLES) with focus on Spanish speakers in the traditional classroom, multiple science courses through Idaho Virtual Campus (IVC) and NASA Opportunities for Visionary Academies (NOVA) to change the way introductory science and mathematics are taught at the undergraduate level. UI has Lewis & Clark Rediscovery project that uses Lewis & Clark theme to focus on NASA Mars mission; has Pew grant (POLYA Project) that provides a mathematics model at the university level that may be extended to secondary schools; provides multiple workshops annually for students and teachers including a summer camp for gifted and talented students and an

annual engineering student challenge to build a Mars Rover. UI is one of 10 mathematics and science curriculum hubs in the US – houses national and regional clearinghouses including: NSF, NASA, Inland NW Science Curriculum and Eisenhower National Clearinghouse Access Center

## School Districts

- Local achievement standards for students are being established. Curricular improvements are also underway in schools.
- High schools offer Advanced Placement courses for students in mathematics or science.
- Meridian Charter Academy operated by the school district provides high school students with specialized, focused curriculum in engineering and technology related fields. (Note: This academy exemplifies a Professional-Technical school offering integrated mathematics, science and career-focused education.)

## Private Efforts

### **J. A. & Kathryn Albertson Foundation Initiatives/Grants**

- Ten school districts have received multi-year grants to focus on systemic reform, curricular alignment, assessment and instruction. Some districts may opt to focus on mathematics and/or science. (BSU and State Department are contracted to assist in coordinating services).
- Higher education institutions have grants to “re-create” teacher education programs; institutional activities include development of partner/professional development schools and districts; redesign of programs to address new standards for teachers; increased efforts among arts and sciences and education colleges to strengthen teacher content knowledge, etc.
- Teaching With Technology project will continue through 2003 reaching 1,800 more teachers K-12 (1000+ have already participated). The project provides teachers with increased skills to engage students through technology.

### **INEEL**

- Jason Project – working with the Discovery Center to align Jason project science curriculum with K-12 standards, and in collaboration with higher education institutions to deliver programs.
- Teaming Teachers With Industry project annually provides teachers opportunity to partner with scientists to improve their instruction.

### **Science & Technology Roundtable**

- Member companies: Micron, Hewlett Packard, Key Bank, Washington Group, INEEL review issues pertinent to the statewide workforce of tomorrow. An education sub-committee investigates and recommends sustainable and replicable K-12 education activities, promotes science in K-12 education and will provide a science teacher of the year award. Committee is proposing creation of industry internship summer experiences for teachers.

### **Discovery Center of Idaho**

Private non-profit organization committed to science education for teachers and students. Has a hands-on science museum, hands-on science inquiry kits refurbishment project and student “invention Convention”.

## Notes –

- State scholarships for students specific to mathematics and science are not available.
- Presently, 12 math teachers and 17 science teachers have achieved National Board Certification
- Idaho Education Association and Idaho Teachers of Mathematics provide professional development programs for teachers.

## **Exhibit 5b**

Please contact Patty Sanchez at (208) 334-2270 or email [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) to obtain a hard copy of the Matrix.

## **Subject**

### **6. Health Professions Workforce Report**

#### **Background and Discussion**

During 1999-2000, the President's Council and CAAP were charged by the SBOE to review postsecondary professional programs in the areas of engineering and related technologies (BSU as lead) legal education (UI as lead), teacher education (LCSC/Idaho's MOST), and Health Professions (ISU as lead). To date, reports and recommendations have been complete for engineering, related technologies, and legal education. The teacher education program review is an ongoing joint process with Idaho's MOST and LCSC. The Health Profession review efforts (lead by ISU) were modified at the January 2000 meeting when staff was charged with the formation of a Health Professions Workforce Studies Ad Hoc Committee (WWAMI, UUSM, BSU, Center for Health Policy, ISU's Rural Health Institute Mountain States Group, Department of Health and Welfare and others as needed) with ISU as the facilitator institution.

The charge to this ad hoc health professions workforce committee was as follows:

- Inventory current health professions programs
- Determine the health professions workforce needs of the state with a focus on nursing, mid-levels, medicine, dentistry and dental hygiene.
- Report and make recommendations to the IRSA/SBOE on workforce needs and trends.

Since that time, the ad hoc group has met five times (March 14, 2000; April 12, 2000; June 12, 2000; September 14, 2000; and May 8, 2001).

Furthermore, the ad hoc membership (see **Exhibit 6a**) was to be flexible depending upon the need and topic.

Since the formation of this ad hoc Committee, the SBOE has taken significant interest in the entire picture of the state's health professions needs, especially given the critical shortage of professional nurses in Idaho.

As a consequence of their charge, IRSA requested that at the June 2001 meeting, the Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee provide the SBOE with the following:

- Status of Idaho's nursing education programs (public and private).
- A vision of where Idaho should be going.
- Draft Plans and timeframe on how to answer the pressing needs of Idaho.

#### **Impact**

The Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee met on May 8, 2001 to initiate the latter of IRSA's charge. The ad hoc committee briefed CAAP at their May 31, 2001 meeting of the following:

- Nursing education programs inventory (**Exhibit 6b**) will be ready in draft form for the IRSA June 2001 meeting.



## **6. Health Professions Workforce Report--continued**

- Idaho Commission on Nursing and Nursing Education (ICNNE) efforts to date.
- Intercollegiate Nursing/Health Profession Centers—various models (e.g., some direct educational providers others policy and research).

The ad hoc committee has agreed by consensus to appoint a task force to study and report out on the various national models that focuses upon intercollegiate nursing and health profession centers. That task force includes Dr. Jim Girvan (BSU), Dean Linda Hatzenbuehler (ISU), Steve Mellard (IHA), Dr. Julia Robinson (ICNNE Consultant), Dr. Pamela Clarke (ICNNE Nursing Program Chair), Dr. Beth Stamm (Idaho Rural Institute), and Dr. Robin Dodson (SBOE's Chief Academic Officer). Also, a subcommittee (Ms. Karen McGee, Dr. Jim Girvan, Dr. Jonathan Lawson, Dr. Julia Robinson, and Dr. Robin Dodson) will be on an on-site visit to Washington State University's Intercollegiate Center in Spokane, Washington.

The three action items were taken as follows:

1. ISU and BSU should work collaboratively to meet the nursing shortage in Southwestern Idaho.
2. The ad hoc committee recommends that the SBOE's FY03 Budget request increases funds for public postsecondary nursing education programs as well as enhanced continuing education opportunities for nurses.
3. The SBOE needs to have the best data on nursing education programs (i.e., applicants, admissions, graduation rates, retention, faculty, etc.) as possible to understand the "big picture" in Idaho. (See **Exhibit 6b**)

Furthermore, the Health Profession Workforce Studies Committee also addressed the pressing situation for the two Family Practice Residency Programs—Boise and Pocatello. As a consequence of the discussion, the HPWS committee would recommend significant funding enhancements (FY03) for the two residencies based upon their significant value to their regions, the underserved/underinsured patient population, training of rural health care providers, and the saving of state and local dollars.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Nursing Education programs/continuing education enhancements and Intercollegiate Nursing/Health Professional Centers unknown. Family Practice Residency FY03 SBOE budget requests approximately \$250,000 per residency for FY03.

### **Motion**

None at this time

### **Attachments**

<b><i>Exhibit 6a</i></b>	<b><i>Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee Membership</i></b>
<b><i>Exhibit 6b</i></b>	<b><i>Nursing Education Program Inventory</i></b>
<b><i>Exhibit 6c</i></b>	<b><i>Nursing Education Issues</i></b>

# Health Professions Workforce Studies

AD HOC TASK FORCE

## Exhibit 6a

### Ms. Karen McGee, SBOE Member

Phone: (208) 232-4779

Fax: (208) 233-5637

E-mail: [kmaster3@home.com](mailto:kmaster3@home.com)

### Dr. Jim Blackman, WWAMI-IDAHO

Phone: (208) 327-0641

Fax: (208) 327-0684

E-Mail: [jblackman@u.washington.edu](mailto:jblackman@u.washington.edu)

E-Mail: [danae@u.washington.edu](mailto:danae@u.washington.edu) (Dana Ellis)

### Dr. Hartzell Cobbs

Mountain States Group/IREC

Phone: (208) 336-5533 ext 226

Fax: (208) 331-0267

E-Mail: [hcobbs@mtnstatesgroup.org](mailto:hcobbs@mtnstatesgroup.org)

### Dr. Robin A. Dodson

Idaho State Board of Education

Phone: (208) 334-2270

Fax: (208) 334-2632

E-Mail: [rdodson@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:rdodson@osbe.state.id.us)

E-Mail: [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) (Patty Sanchez)

### Ms. Laura Rowen

Dept. of Health and Welfare, Primary Care Program

Phone: (208) 334-5993

Fax: (208) 332-7262

E-Mail: [rowenl@idhw.state.id.us](mailto:rowenl@idhw.state.id.us)

### Dr. L. Gary Hart

Center for Health Workforce Studies, WWAMI

Phone: (206) 685-0401

Fax: (206) 616-4768

E-Mail: [ghart@fammed.washington.edu](mailto:ghart@fammed.washington.edu)

E-Mail: [deac@fammed.washington.edu](mailto:deac@fammed.washington.edu) (Heather Deacon)

### Dr. Mike Laskowski

WWAMI Medical Program, UI

Phone: (208) 885-6696

E-Mail: [mlaskow@uidaho.edu](mailto:mlaskow@uidaho.edu)

E-Mail: [brendah@uidaho.edu](mailto:brendah@uidaho.edu) (Brenda Helbing)

### Ms. Linda Powell

Mountain States Group

Phone: (208) 336-5533

E-Mail: [lpowell@mtnstatesgroup.org](mailto:lpowell@mtnstatesgroup.org)

### Dr. Lonnie Shumsky

UUSM Representative, Veterans Medical Center

Address: 4620 N. Pantry Place Boise 83702

Phone: (208) 343-2460

E-Mail: [lonshumsky@aol.com](mailto:lonshumsky@aol.com)

### Dr. Jonathan Lawson, Provost ISU

Phone: (208) 282-2171

Fax: (208) 282-4487

E-Mail: [lawsjona@isu.edu](mailto:lawsjona@isu.edu)

E-Mail: [tryopatt@isu.edu](mailto:tryopatt@isu.edu) (Patty Tryon)

### Dr. Beth Hudnall Stamm, Acting Director

Institute of Rural Health

Phone: (208) 282-4436

Fax: (208) 282-4074

E-Mail: [bhstamm@isu.edu](mailto:bhstamm@isu.edu)

E-Mail: [kreisall@isu.edu](mailto:kreisall@isu.edu) (Sally Kreilach)

### Dr. Jim Girvan, Director

Center for Health Policy, BSU

Phone: (208) 426-4116

Fax: (208) 426-3469

E-Mail: [jgirvan@boisestate.edu](mailto:jgirvan@boisestate.edu)

E-Mail: [acastel@boisestate.edu](mailto:acastel@boisestate.edu) (Anita Castello)

### Dr. Linda Hatzenbuehler, Dean

Health Professions, ISU

Phone: (208) 282-3992

Fax: (208) 282-4645

E-Mail: [hatzlind@isu.edu](mailto:hatzlind@isu.edu)

E-Mail: [hankjo@isu.edu](mailto:hankjo@isu.edu) (Jo Hankerson-Lowther)

### Ms. Sandy Evans

Idaho Board of Nursing

Phone: (208) 334-3110

Fax: (208) 334-3262

E-Mail: [sevans@ibn.state.id.us](mailto:sevans@ibn.state.id.us)

E-Mail: [lcoley@ibn.state.id.us](mailto:lcoley@ibn.state.id.us) (Linda Coley)

### Dr. Pete Kozisek

Family Practice Residency

Phone: (208) 367-6040

E-Mail: [petekozi@sarmc.org](mailto:petekozi@sarmc.org)

E-Mail: [annicurr@sarmc.org](mailto:annicurr@sarmc.org) (Annita Curran)

## **Exhibit 6b**

Please contact Patty Sanchez at (208) 334-2270 or email [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) to obtain a hard copy of the Nursing Education Program Inventory.

# Nursing Education Issues

## Background and Discussion

For the past several months, the Board's Health Professions Workforce Study Committee (HPWS), the Idaho Hospital Association (IHA), and the Idaho Commission on Nursing and Nursing Education (ICNNE) have been concerned about the critical shortage of professional nurses in Idaho. In addition, local and regional hospitals have been in regular dialog with the public and private postsecondary institutions that provide nursing graduates. In addition, the SBOE has heard from two (2) Boise area hospitals of the critical need for professional nurses.

At the April 19, 2001 IRSA meeting, the discussion focused upon institutional expansion of nursing programs, collaborative approaches to meet the increased demands, and planning steps (immediate, medium, and long-term). As a consequence of those discussions, the Committee instructed CAAP to work with HPWS committee and report back to IRSA at their June meeting on how to address the nursing workforce shortage.

The following is a status report on the activities that have occurred since the IRSA April 2001 meeting:

- HPWS committee met on May 8, 2001 to discuss this topic. The Committee has been reviewing various Intercollegic Nursing/Health Profession Centers - both educational delivery models and policy/research center models.
- BSU and ISU have held several meetings with the focus upon developing collaborative nursing program offerings to the Treasure Valley region.
- The May 31, 2001 meeting of CAAP gave this topic significant discussion regarding expansion of the HPWS committee to include community college representation regarding nursing programs, various intercollegic center models, and short-term/long-term planning.
- Inventory of current nursing education programs (See **Exhibit 6b**).

## Impact

Currently, HPWS committee is reviewing the various models that other states have used to meet their professional nursing needs. Further, the Committee will be also studying the various models that address Health Professions programs, both in educational service as well as in policy/research. The Committee's report/recommendation will be in concert with the CAAP review of these issues.

## Fiscal Impact

Potential SBOE budget request FY03 for an increase in funding for nursing and other health professional programs (e.g., Family Practice Residencies).

## Motion

None at this time.

## **Subject**

### **7. Social Worker Issues**

#### **Background and Discussion**

For the past several years, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (DHW) has been contracting with Eastern Washington University (EWU) for a variety of services. The contract was for child welfare training activities, research and program evaluation, Federal Title IV-E stipend program, and work study practicum. The current contract funds are \$929,171 per year with renewal each October 2001. Mr. Karl B. Kurtz, Director of Department of Health and Welfare, as well as members of the SBOE, desire that where possible, Idaho's postsecondary institutions should be offering those services to the DHW. As a consequence, this item was placed on the IRSA agenda in April 2001. At that meeting, staff was instructed to forward a letter to Mr. Kurtz indicating the Board's desires. A copy of the current contract was forwarded to each of the four-year institutions for their review.

#### **Impact**

A copy of the letter from Dr. Greg G. Fitch to Mr. Kurtz is attached. (See Exhibit 7) Furthermore, the four-year institutions have agreed to work together in developing a response for the contract (or parts) renewal October 1, 2001.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

\$929,171 or a percentage of this contract amount.

#### **Motion**

None at this time.

#### **Attachments**

Idaho Department of Health and Welfare April 30, 2001 Letter

## **Exhibit 7**

Please contact Patty Sanchez at (208) 334-2270 or email [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) to obtain a hard copy of the Department of Health and Welfare Letter.

## **Subject**

### **8. Memorandum of Understanding**

#### **Background and Discussion**

Since January 2001, the State Board of Education has heard from different parties regarding the delivery of concurrent enrolled programs to secondary students by an out-of-state institution. The issues presented are quite complex and involve regional accreditation, governance, Idaho Statute compliance, transfer of credits, adjunct faculty, to mention a few. On April 6, 2001, a meeting was held at Idaho State University to discuss policy and resolution issues. As a consequence of that meeting, a Memorandum of Understanding was to be drafted regarding concurrent enrolled programs in Southeastern Idaho. That draft has been reviewed by some Board members, but has not been fully discussed by IRSA.

#### **Impact**

If the Committee and full Board accept this Memorandum of Understanding, it would set forth the guiding principles for in-state and out-of-state institutions regarding concurrently enrolled offerings. Further, it would impact secondary school districts as well.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

Unknown at this time.

#### **Recommendation**

None.

#### **Motion**

Move to approve as a consent agenda item.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attachments**

*Exhibit 8      Memorandum of Understanding Draft*

## Exhibit 8

### Memorandum of Understanding

This memorandum of understanding is between the Idaho State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho (hereinafter "Idaho") and the Utah State Board of Regents (hereinafter "Utah").

Idaho and Utah being the governing Boards for higher education in their respective states, jointly agree that:

1. As of June 30, 2001, Utah's college and universities will cease offering concurrently enrolled college credits in secondary schools in the state of Idaho.
2. From July 1, 2001, both Idaho's and Utah's higher education institutions shall agree to the following standards, procedures, and conditions with regard to the offering of concurrently enrolled college credits in their respective states.
  - a. Each state will pursue efforts to enhance college level courses to their respective secondary schools as a first choice.
  - b. Secondary schools desiring concurrently enrolled college level credits must first contact the higher education institution in their own state and, more specifically, in the respective service area. The host institution has 30 working days in which to respond and shall offer the college credits at no more than 125% of the student's cost(s) offered by the out-of-state institution.
  - c. If the higher education institution in the respective service area does not respond positively, then that institution may facilitate concurrently enrolled college credits from an in-state sister institution.
  - d. If an in-state sister higher education institution does not respond positively, the requesting in-state secondary school may then seek an out-of-state higher education institution to offer such college level credits.
  - e. Prior to offering of concurrently enrolled college credits by an out-of-state higher education institution, the following must be met:
    - i. Approval by the institution's governing board;
    - ii. Compliance with the both states' laws, rules, and regulations and any state registration policies.
    - iii. Approval from the accrediting agency that accredits the out-of-state higher education institution desiring to offer such concurrently enrolled college level credits.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001 and continually until June 30, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Gregory G. Fitch  
Executive Director  
Idaho State Board of Education

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Cecelia U. Foxley  
Executive Officer/Commissioner  
Utah State Board of Regents



## **Subject**

### **9. New Program Requests**

## **Background and Discussion**

Pursuant to SBOE policies, all new programs (i.e., degrees and certificates) and/or program changes with a fiscal impact greater than \$150,000 per year must have full Board approval. Idaho State University is requesting Board approval for a Master of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science. If approved, this new degree will be offered in both Pocatello and Boise, January 2002.

At the May 31, 2001 meeting of CAAP, the committee agreed after review (need, quality, demand, centrality, and fiscal) to recommend IRSA/SBOE approval of this request.

## **Impact**

The institution requesting these new programs, if Board approved, will implement these requests and will be subject to future monitoring for program compliance.

## **Fiscal Impact**

See Attachment (**Exhibit 9a**)

## **Recommendation**

Both CAAP and Board Staff recommend approval by IRSA and the full Board.

## **Motion**

To approve ISU's request to offer a Master of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## **Attachments**

Exhibit 9a New Program Approval: Master of Science, Clinical Laboratory Sciences

## Exhibit 9

### **New Program Approval: Master of Science, Clinical Laboratory Sciences**

Idaho State University is requesting Board approval for a new Master of Science degree in Clinical Laboratory Sciences (formerly Medical Technology).

This request has three components. **First**, ISU requests an expansion of their existing B.S. Program to serve Idaho citizens outside their existing service area. **Second**, ISU desires to offer a new MS in clinical laboratories science to both Pocatello and Boise. **Third**, the institution's request includes the delivery of major components of both the existing B.S. and new MS degree via electronic and web based technology. The electronic/web delivery will enhance the access to Idaho citizens independent of location and will result in the development of strategic partners in the private sector to provide clinical experience as well as meeting workforce needs.

In Idaho and in the nation, there is a critical shortage of clinical laboratory trained professionals. This request will have a significant impact on those critical clinical laboratory needs in both rural and urban hospitals.

The CAAP at its April and May 2001 meetings reviewed this request in accordance with the SBOE policy and guidelines (quality, demand/needs, centrality, students, duplication and fiscal resources). At their May 31, 2001 meeting, the Council took action to recommend to IRSA and the SBOE approval of this request.

If the SBOE approves this request, they will require two new faculty positions (one in Pocatello and one in Boise) and a 0.5 support position. It is anticipated that there would be 7.0 new B.S. students and 5.0 new M.S. students at each site. The fiscal impact would be \$230,635 (new appropriated) FY02, \$22,500 FY03, and \$7,500 FY04.

## **Subject**

### **10. Collaborative Funding Distributions Recommendations**

## **Background and Discussion**

The SBOE's FY02 request included a \$2.0 million item for "collaborative centers." The 2001 Legislative Session did act to fund this request at the \$1.0 million level. In both the Board's Budget request and the JFAC Action Program Proof Language, the funds are to be held by OSBE, and each year, an Oversight Council shall allocate the funds to each center. The SBOE request that CAAP develop a recommendation on what defines a center and how those funds were to be allocated.

## **Impact**

As a consequence of the Board's charge, the CAAP discharged the SBOE's task at their May 31, 2001 meeting. That recommendation is exhibited in **Exhibit 10**.

## **Fiscal Impact**

See attached item. (**Exhibit 10**)

## **Motion**

To approve CAAP's recommendations as shown in **Exhibit 10**.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## **Attachments**

***Exhibit 10 Collaborative Center Recommendations***

### Recommendations on "Collaborative Centers"

#### Background:

At its April Board meeting, the Board requested that the Chief Academic Officers of the public four-year institutions and the Board's Chief Academic Officer work in concert to develop a definition of what constitutes a "collaborative center." The Board is to use that definition for the distribution of the \$1.0 million FY02 Appropriations for such "centers."

The Chief Academic Officers of the seven institutions held a conference call on May 24, 2001. It was determined that there is not a lot of flexibility with the definition given on Collaborative Centers as stated on the FY2002 JFAC Action Program Proof. Therefore, the Chief Academic Officers recommend that the definition given on the appropriation bill be presented to the Board at its June meeting.

#### Recommendations for Distribution:

1. Recommend: to formalize the *Magic Valley* Oversight Council as well as an Advisory Committee--UI, BSU, ISU, CSI. Fund as follows:

For \$250K--Provided that the four-year institutions free up physical space instructional area.

- 25% BSU
- 25% UI
- 50% ISU \$125K

2. Recommend: in the *Treasure Valley* area create an Oversight Council as well as an Advisory Committee structure--UI, BSU, ISU, CSI. Fund as follows:

Recommend *Treasure Valley*-Boise

- 1/3 each to BSU, ISU, and UI

3. Recommend: fund *North Idaho* and *South Eastern Idaho* "centers" \$250k beginning July 2001 as follows:

*South Eastern Idaho*

- 2+2 programs (EITC partnership) ranging between \$25 to \$50k, balance to UI/ISU equally
- Programs (Distance Learning-Community Based)
- Security issues \$40k
- New Programs (Community Based)

*North Idaho*

- \$75,000 each to UI and LCSC; \$50k to NIC and ISU
- \$50k to NIC will replace UI and LCSC library charges

4. Recommend: the current Oversight Council (comprised of President, Provost, and OSBE Staff) review the existing organizational structure for all regional collaborative programs.

## **Subject**

### **11. Intellectual Property Policy--Final Reading**

#### **Background and Discussion**

The Board is being requested to take action to accept an Intellectual Property rule that has been in place for the past 13 years as a temporary policy. During the 2001 legislative session that rule was repealed per Board request. That action will permit the Board to govern this subject area by policy rather than by rule. The effective date of this repeal is July 1, 2001. Hence, the Board staff in concert with a statewide Intellectual Property Review Committee has been meeting frequently since January 2001 to develop a policy that could replace the current rule.

At the April 19, 2001 meeting of IRSA, the Board took action to approve for first reading the new policy draft. However, at the IRSA meeting, significant concerns were raised by both Board members and the institutional Chief Academic Officers. Furthermore, CAAP has not taken formal action on this policy draft. In response to the various concerns, Kevin Satterlee, Deputy Attorney General stated that if the new policy was delayed until after the June 2001 Board meeting, a temporary rule or a drafting of the current form of rule into a policy could allow for the extension of the repealed rules until the various issues raised could be addressed. As a consequence, IRSA took action to table the new policy language.

The statewide Intellectual Property Review Committee held a meeting to discuss this issue on May 7, 2001. As a result, the committee recommended that:

1. The current rule language be adopted as a policy until the Statewide Committee and Board resolves the number of concerns previously raised. That draft is shown as **Exhibit 11** as a final reading document (First Reading May 16, 2001).
2. An external consultant be employed to assist the committee with resolution of the raised concerns. The committee recommended contacting Ms. Marianne Clarke, Battelle or one of her colleagues to see if they could assist the Statewide Committee and the Board with the Intellectual Property Policy for the state.

At the May 16, 2001 SBOE meeting, the Board took action to approve this draft policy (current rule language) for first reading.

#### **Impact**

The draft policy on Intellectual Property contains the same language as the repealed rule. If the Board approves this policy it would provide a form of a “temporary policy” in place, thus allowing for time to work on the raised concerns. On May 4, 2001, Dr. Robin Dodson and Jimmi Sommer, BSU graduate student, had a teleconference call with David Hochman, Senior Principal Battelle Technology Partnership Practice, on whether they were interested in assisting the Board and the Statewide Committee on the concerns and issues. As a consequence, Battelle has indicated an interest and willingness to provide an external review of the policy language of the proposed new policy.

## **11. Intellectual Property Policy--Final Reading--continued**

### **Fiscal Impact**

None at this time.

### **Recommendation**

CAAP and the Board's Chief Academic Officer recommend approval of this draft policy for final reading with the understanding that this policy would remain in place until the Statewide Committee, external consultant, and the Board can work through the concerns raised with the new policy on intellectual property policy.

### **Motion**

To approve the modifications to the Board's Intellectual Property Policy as shown in **Exhibit 11** for Final Reading.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

### **Attachments**

***Exhibit 11 Board's Intellectual Property Policy***

**Idaho State Board of Education****GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES****SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

---

IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001  
Temporary Policy-Draft

**A. Intellectual Property****1. Objectives and Purposes**

The State Board of Education, on behalf of the state of Idaho, and the Board of Regents, on behalf of the University of Idaho, (hereinafter collectively referred to as the State Board) recognize the dynamic relationship between research and education in postsecondary institutions. The State Board recognizes the inventions, discoveries and published works of commercial importance may be the natural outgrowth of research. The State Board intends to promote the use of intellectual properties for the public good. While postsecondary institutions must remain open to intellectual inquiry, at times this openness is juxtaposed with the obligations to contribute to the economic growth and development of Idaho and the nation. The following intellectual property policies balance the institutional obligations to preserve open inquiry and realize the commercial value of intellectual property produced by employees of the State's postsecondary educational institutions.

**2. Intellectual Property**

- a.** Claim of ownership interest. The State Board of Education, on behalf of the state of Idaho, and the Board of Regents, on behalf of the University of Idaho, claim ownership of any invention or patentable discovery developed under any of the following circumstances:
  - i.** Arising from any work performed by an employee of the State Board during the course of his duties to the agency or institution;
  - ii.** Arising from any work performed by an employee of the State Board using state resources not similarly available to members of the general public; or
  - iii.** Arising from any work performed by an employee of the State Board under contract in a program or project sponsored by a State Board agency or institutions or a closely related research foundation.
- b.** Disclaimer of ownership interest. The State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho claim no ownership interest in any invention or patentable discovery developed by the employees or contractors under the following circumstances:
  - i.** When the work is performed outside their assigned duties; and
  - ii.** When the employee/contractor is without benefit of State facilities except those available to members of the general public, such as libraries.

**Idaho State Board of Education**  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

---

**IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001**  
**Temporary Policy-Draft**

- c. Agency policy review. Agencies and institutions under the governance of the State Board must secure to the state of Idaho their ownership interest in inventions and patentable discoveries. Agency and institutional policies setting out patent administration, including evaluating, financing, assignment, marketing, protection, and the division and use of royalties, as well as amendments thereto, must be submitted to the State Board for its review and approval.
- d. Condition of employment. State Board employees and contractors must, as a condition of employment of contract, agree and adhere to the State Board approved policy on inventions and patentable discoveries.

**3. Copyrights**

- a. When employees or contractors are expressly directed to produce specific work for publication in the course of their employment, the agency or institution may reserve the right to copyright the publication in the name of the state of Idaho or the University of Idaho or to publish such work without copyright.
- b. Except as noted in 3.a. above, the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho claim no ownership interest in works submitted for publication by State Board employees and contractors. Employees and contractors retain the right to copyright and publish their own works. That is, as a general rule, all rights to copyrightable material are the property of the creator. The distribution of royalties, if any, is a matter of arrangement between the creator and his publishers or licensees. However, institutions subject to this rule may elect, by contract or policy, to claim an interest in copyrightable material produced, in whole or part, by their employees or contractors. For example, different treatment may be accorded by an institution in cases of specific contracts providing for an exception, in cases where the constituent institution or sponsor may employ personnel for the purpose of producing a specific work, where different treatment is deemed necessary to reflect the contribution of the institution to the work as in the case of software, mask works for microcircuit chips, or audiovisual material, or where a sponsored agreement requires otherwise.

**4. Intellectual Property Transfer**

- a. The State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho delegate to Idaho's postsecondary educational institutions the right to transfer and convey ownership in intellectual properties developed within the institutions under the patents and copyright rule. This rule will allow the institutions to play appropriate roles in knowledge transfer and economic growth and development. Under this rule, the institutions may:



**Idaho State Board of Education**  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

---

**IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001**  
**Temporary Policy-Draft**

- i. Grant rights to owned intellectual properties to research foundations for further development or transfer.
  - ii. Themselves act as licensors to convey intellectual property rights to commercial ventures.
  - iii. Grant exclusive rights to a licensee.
  - iv. Collect and disburse license payments to inventors and their departments and colleges, as well as to their institutions, for the general support of research within the institutions.
  - v. Permit institutional employees the right to participate in ownership and governance of companies licensed by the institutions to produce and market the discoveries, provided the conflict of interest rules are followed.
- b. Each of Idaho's postsecondary institutions shall, within twelve (12) months of the promulgation of this rule, submit its policy on the transfer of intellectual properties (technology transfer) for State Board review and approval. At a minimum, the policy should include:
  - i. The name of the institutional position (or office) with the authority and responsibility for carrying out the policy and binding the institution contractually.
  - ii. Policy and plans for patent acquisition (i.e., who initiates, who pays the lawyers, and an enumeration of the duties, responsibilities, and a process for settling debates).
  - iii. The range of allowable institutional involvement in the transfer process (i.e., from licensing to acceptance of institutional ownership interests, continued development in institutional facilities for the benefit of the licensee, business planning or production assistance).
- c. The appropriate officer of each postsecondary institution shall report, two (2) weeks in advance of the State Board meeting, on patent, copyright, and technology transfer activities that have occurred at the institution since the prior meeting of the Board. With respect to patents, the report shall include what public notice was given prior to the licensee(s) being selected. Further, that report will also indicate whether employees of the institution or its respective research foundation have a financial interest in the company to which the intellectual property was transferred. Terms of any license or technology transfer contract will be made available in confidence upon request for inspection by the State Board.

## **Subject**

### **12. Final Reading--Accelerated Learning Policy**

#### **Background and Discussion**

In the past several months, there has been much discussion regarding advance placement programs, concurrent enrollment opportunities, and changes to the SBOE's policy on Accelerated Learning. As a result, CAAP has spent considerable time and effort to modify the Board's policy and to address the issues of communication, student choice, equity, quality, adjunct faculty, and other related issues. During all of the discussion, the Council strongly supported the Board's desires and efforts to provide opportunities for qualified secondary students to enroll in college level courses at various sites.

At the April 19, 2001 State Board of Education meeting, action was taken to approve changes to the existing Accelerated Learning Policy for first reading.

#### **Impact**

As a result of the many conversations and suggestions since the April SBOE meeting, certain modifications to the first reading draft have been placed in this final reading document (**Exhibit 12a**). In general, those changes are:

- Clarification on definitions and charging of a fee.
- Changes to the eligibility and admission requirements.
- The addition of Section 5 dealing with adjunct faculty qualifications.

Also, for Board consideration is the recommendation by CAAP to create a statewide committee on Accelerated Learning Programs (**Exhibit 12b**). The purpose, function, membership, meetings, and reporting are shown in **Exhibit 12b**.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

Current Board policy on fees provides direction to the public four-year institutions on fees for concurrently enrolled programs. It may be of value to revisit those policies and/or initiate discussion focus upon legislative appropriation for Accelerated Learning Programs.

#### **Motion**

To approve the modifications to the SBOE's Accelerated Learning Policy for final reading.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attachment**

*Exhibit 12a Accelerated Learning Policy*

*Exhibit 12b Potential Accelerated Learning Addition*

IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001  
Published February 2000

## **Y. Accelerated Learning Program**

### **1. Coverage.**

Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, and the University of Idaho are covered by these policies. North Idaho College, the College of Southern Idaho and Eastern Idaho Technical College are also covered since post-secondary programs intended for transfer come under the purview of the Board.

### **2. Purpose.**

The State Board of Education has made a commitment to improve the educational opportunities to Idaho citizens by creating a seamless system. To this end, the Board has instructed its post-secondary institutions to provide educational programs and training to their respective service regions, support and enhance regional and statewide economic development, and to collaborate with the public elementary and secondary schools. In addition to the Board's desire to prepare secondary graduates for post-secondary programs, the Board also is interested in accelerated learning programs for qualified secondary students. These programs have the potential for reducing the overall costs of secondary and post-secondary programs to the students and institutions.

The primary intent of the Board is to develop a policy for accelerated learning programs for secondary students which would:

- a. Enhance their post-secondary goals;
- b. Reduce duplication and provide for an easy transition between secondary and post-secondary education; and
- c. Reduce the overall cost of educational services and training.

### **3. Definitions**

There are many different accelerated learning programs which students may access to receive post-secondary credit for education completed while enrolled in the secondary system. Examples of academic credit bearing programs include dual enrollment/concurrent enrollment courses, Advanced Placement (AP), and College Level Examination Program (CLEP). Tech Prep is considered to be an accelerated learning program and may result in college credit; however, by definition (see below) it is not a concurrent enrollment program, etc. For the purpose of this policy the State Board of Education considers three different types of accelerated learning programs depending upon the delivery site and faculty. They are:

Idaho State Board of Education  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

---

IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001  
Published February 2000

- a. A regular college course delivered by the ~~post-secondary institution~~ college/university on its own campus. A high school student who selects this option would be admitted as a non-matriculating college student.

Policy

The student is charged the standard part-time credit hour fee or tuition, including activity fees.

- b. A course is delivered in the high school by one of three ways (see below) and the educational costs are borne by the ~~post-secondary institution~~ college/university. ~~The~~ Course delivery could be delivered a number of different may be by one of three following ways ~~such as~~:

- ~~through technology into the high school;~~
- ~~a course taught in the high school by post-secondary institution faculty; or~~
- ~~a post-secondary institution employs high school faculty to teach the course(s);~~
- 1) By distance/learning technology from the college /university to the high school;
- 2) A college/university full-time faculty member teaches the course at the high school; and
- 3) The college/university employs an adjunct faculty member to teach the course in the high school.

Policy

A student who selects this option ~~would~~ will be admitted by the post-secondary institution as a ~~non-matriculating- non-degree seeking student- (i.e. part-time student meaning a maximum of 7 credits or two courses per semester)~~ and will be charged a part-time education fee [SBOE Policy V.R.1.a.(4)].

- c. A course is delivered at the high school by secondary faculty, and the costs are borne either by the high school or the student. Examples include AP and; CLEP ~~or Tech Prep~~ courses. Students may request an institutional evaluation of such course for acceptance as college credit.

Policy

The post-secondary institutions may charge an administrative fee for transcribing the credit or assuring equivalency.

- d. Four (4) semester college credits are equivalent to at least one (1) full year (2 semesters) of high school credit in that subject.

Idaho State Board of Education  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

---

IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001  
Published February 2000

e. **Tech Prep:** Tech Prep is defined by the federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998. The articulated tech prep course must be part of a recognized professional-technical non-duplicative sequential program of study that consists, at a minimum, of two years of secondary and two years of postsecondary study, is carried out under a written articulation agreement, provides opportunity for students to earn postsecondary credit, and leads to a specific postsecondary professional-technical two-year certificate or degree.

For purposes of this policy, Tech Prep is not exclusively considered concurrent enrollment (e.g., AP or CLEP), but rather an accelerated learning offering that may result in college credit. Conditions for awarding of college credit are determined by each postsecondary professional-technical institution and are described in the articulation agreement.

#### **4. Eligibility and Admission Requirements**

In compliance with Idaho Code 33-5104, prior to enrolling, the student and the student's parent/guardian must sign a counseling form, provided by the school district, that outlines the provisions of ~~the~~this section of ~~this~~ Code. Additionally, by March 1 of each year a school district shall provide general information about this program to all 10 and 11 students (Idaho Code 33-5105).

Parents, students, and school counselors/principals are advised to explore the impact of Accelerated Learning Programs in the following areas:

- a. Some colleges and universities in region or nationally may not accept certain credits earned in these accelerated programs.
- b. The college credits earned may impact the secondary GPA.
- c. Eligibility for scholarship opportunities may be impacted by the earning of concurrent enrolled credits.

Further, any high school student may make application to one of the public postsecondary institutions provided the following requirements are met:

- a. In compliance with Idaho Code 33-202, the student has reached the minimum age of 16 years or has successfully completed at least one-half of the high school graduation requirements as certified by the high school.
- b. Submission of the counseling form which includes written permission from the student's parent/guardian, and principal or counselor.
- c. Submission of the appropriate institutional application material for admission.
- d. If required by institutional policy, a student must obtain approval of the instructor to enroll in a course.

**Idaho State Board of Education**  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

---

IRSA - Draft June 21-22, 2001  
Published February 2000

- e. Written notification of acceptance to the institution will be provided to the student after he or she submits the appropriate application.
- f. Those high school students meeting the above requirements will be permitted to enroll on a part-time basis for a maximum of 7 credits or two courses per semester or on a full-time basis taking at least 8 credits per semester.
- g. Students seeking admission who do not meet the above requirements may petition the institution's admission committee for consideration.

**5. Adjunct Faculty Qualifications**

The following criteria are to be used in determining the adjunct faculty qualifications for those dual enrollment/concurrent enrollment courses that are college credit bearing. These qualifications do not apply to AP, CLEP, or Tech Prep course offerings.

- a. All adjunct faculty are expected to have earned a Masters Degree or equivalent in the subject area and will be considered as temporary or special exempt employees of the SBOE. (SBOE Policy II.G.3).
- b. The appropriate college/university department must approve adjunct faculty. Selection criteria for adjunct faculty teaching dual enrollment courses shall be the same criteria applied to other adjunct faculty appointments within the department.
- c. Faculty who hold college/university adjunct faculty status will be included as fully as possible in the academic life of the appropriate department.
- d. Faculty appointed as college/university adjunct faculty will agree to the following:
  - Use of course syllabus provided by the department;
  - Use of the same department textbooks;
  - Participate in the outcome assessment process of the department;
  - A contractual relationship or memorandum of understanding between the college/university and the secondary faculty must be in effect; and
  - The college course grade earned will be the same grade posted on the high school transcript of the student.

### ACCELERATED LEARNING POLICY: POTENTIAL ADDITION

Statewide Committee for Recommendations and Advise to the  
State Board of Education on Accelerated Learning Programs

**Purpose:** Improve Relationships Between Postsecondary Education and Public Education regarding Concurrent Enrollment Programs

**Function:**

1. Cooperative efforts to oversee concurrent enrollment programs at the state, district, and school levels.
2. Recommend Policy Changes
3. Assure Quality of Concurrent Enrollment Classes
4. Funding Recommendation
5. Promote and inform the schools, parents, students, and general public on concurrent enrollment programs.

**Membership:** School Administrator from each Statewide District (6 regions); Chief Academic Officers of the seven public postsecondary institutions or their representation, Division of Professional-Technical Education, Department of Education, and the SBOE's Chief Academic Officer who will act as chair. (SBOE members?)

**Meetings:** At least two annual meetings

**Report:** To IRSA Committee through CAAP

## **Subject**

### **13. HERC Recommendation: FY02 Research Center Grant Program**

#### **Background and Discussion**

Every third year, the Higher Education Research Council (HERC) runs a Research Center Grant Competition in accordance with SBOE policy. The Research Center Grants are intended to establish a focused research center at one of the three universities, which will provide research teams with the necessary facilities and researchers necessary to conduct investigative efforts at a nationally competitive level. Further, these centers have a significant economic benefit to the state and region. A center is funded for a three-year period at which time the center must be self-supporting. To date, the SBOE has funded four such centers and this item, if approved, would be a fifth center if approved by the SBOE. The four previously funded centers have met all of the SBOE's expectations.

#### **Impact**

The Research Center Program requires both a paper and an on-site review by external peer reviewers. The latter results in a formal report signed by the review team (**Exhibit 13.**). HERC receives that report and then takes action to forward a recommendation to IRSA and the full Board. At the June 5, 2001 meeting, HERC did take action to recommend funding of the Idaho Accelerator Center at ISU (Exhibit 13.)

#### **Motions**

To approve funding of the ISU Idaho Accelerator Center as recommended by HERC and the on-site review panel.

Moved by\_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by\_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attachments**

***Exhibit 13      Formal Report Signed by Review Team and Summaries of each center.***



## **Exhibit 13**

Please contact Patty Sanchez at (208) 334-2270 or email [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) to obtain a hard copy of the Formal Report Signed by the Review Team and Summaries of each center.